



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,212	09/22/2000	Patrick Callaghan	END919990068US1	9821
26502	7590	05/15/2006		EXAMINER
IBM CORPORATION				PAULA, CESAR B
IPLAW IQ0A/40-3				
1701 NORTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ENDICOTT, NY 13760			2178	

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/668,212	CALLAGHAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	CESAR B. PAULA	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 22-28,30,32-37 and 39-44 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 22-28,30,32-37 and 39-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 3/1/2006.

**This action is made Final.**

2. In the amendment, claims 29, 31, and 38 have been canceled. Claims 22-28, 30, 32-37, and 39-44 are pending in the case. Claims 22-23, 30, 32 and 41 are independent claims.

3. The rejection of claims 22, 27-29, 31, 36-38, and 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Uppaluru (Pat. # 6,400,806 B1, 6/4/2002, filed on 4/5/1999), has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The rejection of claims 30, 39, and 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppaluru, has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

5. The rejection of claims 23-26, 32-35, and 42-44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppaluru, in view of Dipaolo et al, hereinafter Dipaolo (USPat.# 5,367,619, 11/22/1994) has been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

***Drawings***

6. The drawings filed on 9/22/2000 have been approved by the Examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 22, 30, 36-37, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppaluru (Pat. # 6,400,806 B1, 6/4/2002, filed on 4/5/1999), in view of O'Sullivan (Pat. # 5,493,608 B1, 2/20/1996).

Regarding independent claim 22, Uppaluru discloses the use of a conventional browser on a computer, which is modified with appropriate voice information extensions using HVML (Hyper Voice Markup Language) for downloading from a web server, playing and playing web pages, such as web forms— *audiovisual form in a written markup language*—which have input headings, *such as* day, month, year information, business white pages form (company name, city, state code information), etc *displaying said form with the respective headings and respective blank areas to be updated with text*. The user can navigate or interact with the voice web pages using the mouse, and microphone—*verbal, and tactile interaction*--. Using tags, a user can also supply input, such as spoken alphabet, and digit, keyword, proper names, and free-form voice information input into HVML forms--*said form including fields with respective headings and respective blank areas to be updated with text*--, for the purpose of filling in these forms, and submitting to an agent for processing. When the browser encounters a “PAUSE” statement, it

pauses until an amount of time specified in a “TIMEOUT” attribute has elapsed or an user input is entered—*said form specifying for said headings a predetermined time to wait for a response from a user after a web browser audibly rereads said each heading* (col.6, lines 53-57, col.8, line 2-col.9, line 6, col.10, line 34-col.11, line 14, col.12, lines 6-67, col.24, lines 53-67).

Moreover, Uppaluru discloses prompting for the input of information into a web page, such as a calendar form using the conventional browser. The forms displayed on the user’s monitor are filled in as a result of the user input. The input originates from a mouse, microphone, etc. (col.8, line 2-col.9, line 6, col.10, line 34-col.11, line 14, col.12, lines 20-67)--  
*audibly reading one of said headings and waiting for a user to audibly respond with corresponding text for the blank area associated with said one heading, and in response to said user audibly responding with said corresponding text, said browser updating the written markup language for said form to include said corresponding text for said one blank area and displaying on said client workstation an updated state of the form with said one heading and with said corresponding text typed into said blank area associated with said one heading*

Further, Uppaluru teaches the inputting of a company’s partial information, such as company name, city, state code information, into the voice web query forms, and retrieving information from a database over the Internet, such as company’s complete information using response pages, which are presented as a result of the partial submission of information (col. 10, lines 34-col.11, line 14, col.12, lines 11-67). In other words, once the form is filled in it is submitted to the server and the complete information is retrieved and sent within a presentation page *subsequently, in response to said user speaking a command to said browser to send the updated written markup language for the updated form to said application in said server, said*

*client workstation sending the updated written markup language for said updated form to said application in said server for processing.* Uppaluru fails to explicitly teach *the web browser audibly rereads said each heading.* However, O'Sullivan discloses that if a caller makes an error in response to a voice message prompt or does not enter a response within the set response time, the voice response systems will generally repeat the voice message prompt and ask the caller to try again (col.1, line 49-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Uppaluru, and O'Sullivan, because O'Sullivan teaches above the benefit of allowing a user to respond to a prompt for information. This would have allowed the user to promptly respond to an audio prompt, and quickly provide the information desired by the user.

Regarding independent claim 30, limitations *a client workstation receiving from a server....a web browser in said client workstation....* correspond to similar limitations in claim 22, and therefore are similarly rejected. Uppaluru discloses a web browser voice output —*audio queue*— for prompting, and playing voice strings in the order they are found in a web page (one right after the other). The “PAUSE TIMEOUT” attribute for pausing indefinitely (if a value is 0) for a user until an input is made— *said web browser audibly reading said one heading* (col.10, lines 34-67, col.23, lines 39-67. Uppaluru fails to explicitly teach *and in response to lapse of said predetermined time, reminding said user to audibly respond with corresponding text for the blank area associated with said other heading.* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to prompt the user again for input, because Uppaluru teaches above termination of input standby if the time expires, so when an input is

mandatory for the field, this combination would provide the benefit of obtaining the mandatory input, and avoiding error triggered by not having all the necessary input.

Moreover, Uppaluru discloses the input of information into the voice forms using a keyword *keyboard entry of the text for a blank area* (col.8, lines 2-67). Uppaluru fails to explicitly teach *instead of audibly responding with corresponding text for the blank area associated with said other heading, said user audibly responding with a spoken command for said browser to accept keyboard entry of the text for the blank area associated with said other heading, and based on said spoken command for said browser to accept said keyboard entry, said browser accepting subsequent keyboard of the text for said blank area associated with said other heading*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to respond with a keyword from a keyboard entry, because this would provide the benefit to input a piece of text quicker than using the voice response. Uppaluru fails to explicitly teach *the web browser audibly rereading said one heading*. However, O'Sullivan discloses that if a caller makes an error in response to a voice message prompt or does not enter a response within the set response time, the voice response systems will generally repeat the voice message prompt and ask the caller to try again (col.1, line 49-67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Uppaluru, and O'Sullivan, because O'Sullivan teaches above the benefit of allowing a user to respond to a prompt for information. This would have allowed the user to promptly respond to an audio prompt, and quickly provide the information desired by the user.

Claims 36-37 are directed towards a computer program for performing the steps found in claims 27-28 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 39, which depends on claim 32, Uppaluru discloses the entering of a “SKIP”—*command*-- selection for skipping a form value within a voice form to another field (col.25, lines 61-67, col.8, lines 63-67).

Moreover, Uppaluru discloses the entering of a “REVIEW” —*command*-- selection for reviewing form values within a voice form (col.25, lines 61-67). Uppaluru fails to explicitly teach *a command that directs the browser to review the form to ensure that all fields contain information*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have reviewed the form to ensure information was present in all fields, because Uppaluru teaches above the reviewing of all the values in a voice form, which provides the benefit of supplying appropriate information in the forms so as to retrieve information using the form without incurring an error, which would also save time needed in refilling the wrong values in the form.

Further, Uppaluru discloses the entering of a “reset” —*command*-- selection for reverting to the original default values of the form—*deleting text currently within a field* (col.25, lines 46-67).

Furthermore, Uppaluru discloses the entering of a “reload” —*command*-- selection for reloading a form (col.25, lines 46-67). Uppaluru fails to explicitly teach *a command that directs the browser to clear the form and reprocess it*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to reprocess the reloaded form, because

Uppaluru teaches above the submitting of information to a server, which provides the benefit of supplying a form in accordance to a user's input, so as to provide the correct information to the server.

'Claim 40 is directed towards a computer program for performing the steps found in claim 30, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Claim 41 is directed towards a client for performing the steps found in claim 22, and therefore is similarly rejected.

9. Claims 23-28, 32-35, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uppaluru, in view of O'Sullivan, and further in view of Dipaolo et al, hereinafter Dipaolo (USPat.# 5,367,619, 11/22/1994).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 22, limitations *a client workstation storing an audiovisual form....a user to audibly respond with corresponding text for the blank area associated with said one heading* corresponds to similar limitations in claim 22, and therefore are similarly rejected. Uppaluru discloses prompting for the input of information into a web page, such as a calendar form using the conventional browser—*without user selection of said one heading or the blank area associated with said one heading*. The forms displayed on the user's monitor are filled in as a result of the user input. The input originates from a mouse, microphone, etc. (col.8, line 2-col.9, line 6, col.10, line 34-col.11, line 14, col.12, lines 20-67)—

*in response to said user speaking said corresponding text, said browser displaying an updated state of the form with said one heading and with said corresponding text entered in said blank area.* Uppaluru fails to explicitly teach *while said browser audibly reads said one heading, said browser automatically displaying a plurality of valid alternatives for said blank area associated with said one heading, one of said valid alternatives being said corresponding text.* However, Dipaolo discloses when a user moves to a certain field, presenting a window, which contains valid values for that specific field (col.6, lines 20-67, fig.1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Uppaluru, and Dipaolo, because Dipaolo teaches the benefit of eliminating the need to remember suitable entries for a field, thus saving time and reducing errors (col.1, lines 26-37).

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Uppaluru discloses prompting for the input of information into a web page, such as a calendar form using the conventional browser. The forms displayed on the user's monitor are filled in as a result of the user input. The input originates from a mouse, microphone, etc. The form is then submitted to a server-- *said browser updating the written markup language for said form to include said corresponding text for said blank area associated with said one heading* (col.8, line 2-col.9, line 6, col.10, line 34-col.11, line 14, col.12, lines 20-67, col.25, lines 50-53).

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 24, Uppaluru discloses prompting for the input of information into a web page, such as a calendar form using the conventional browser. The forms displayed on the user's monitor are filled in as a result of the user input. The input

originates from a mouse, microphone, etc. -- *said browser performs the steps of updating the written markup language for said form and displaying an updated state of the form with said one heading and with said corresponding text typed in said blank area associated with said one heading and subsequently, said browser audibly reading another of said headings and waiting for a user to speak another text for the blank area associated with said other heading, and in response to said user speaking said other text, said browser updating the written markup language for said form to include said other text for said blank area associated with said other heading and displaying an updated state of the form with said other heading and with said other text typed in said blank area associated with said other heading* (col.8, line 2-col.9, line 6, col.10, line 34-col.11, line 14, col.12, lines 20-67). Uppaluru fails to explicitly teach, *said browser ceases to display said plurality of valid alternatives for said blank area*. However, Dipaolo discloses when a user moves to a certain field, presenting a window, which contains valid values for that specific field, and entering a value from the list of valid values into the form field. There is also an automatic entry of values, whenever there is only a single value associated with a field (thus no need to present a window of values) (col.6, lines 20-67, fig.1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Uppaluru, and Dipaolo, because Dipaolo teaches the benefit of eliminating the need to remember suitable entries for a field, thus saving time and reducing errors (col.1, lines 26-37).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 22, Uppaluru discloses prompting for the input of information into a web page, such as a calendar form using the conventional browser—*without user selection of said one heading or the blank area associated with said one heading*.

The forms displayed on the user's monitor are filled in as a result of the user input. The input originates from a mouse, microphone, etc. (col.8, line 2-col.9, line 6, col.10, line 34-col.11, line 14, col.12, lines 20-67). Uppaluru fails to explicitly teach, *said browser automatically graphically indicating that said blank area associated with said one heading, and not any other blank area associated with any other heading, is currently waiting for said corresponding text from said user.* However, Dipaolo discloses when a user moves to a certain field, presenting a window, which contains valid values for that specific field, and entering a value from the list of valid values into the form field. (col.6, lines 20-67, fig.1). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Uppaluru, and Dipaolo, because Dipaolo teaches the benefit of eliminating the need to remember suitable entries for a field, thus saving time and reducing errors (col.1, lines 26-37).

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 23, Uppaluru discloses a voice form in a voice browser —*computer programming*— prompting for the input of information into a web page form (col. 6, lines 1-52, col.10, lines 34-col.11, line 14).

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 23, Uppaluru discloses the entering of a “SKIP” selection for skipping a form value within a voice form. The user fills in various fields in the form being displayed to the user (col.25, lines 61-67, col.8, lines 63-67, col.10, lines 34-col.11, line 14) —*said browser responding to a spoken command by said user to skip entry of text into said blank area associated with said one heading and advance to a next one of said fields, said user speaking next text for a blank area of said next one of said fields, and in*

*response to said user speaking said next text for said blank area of said next one of said fields, said browser updating the written markup language for said form to include said next text for said blank area for said next one of said fields and displaying an updated state of the form with said next text for said next one of said fields--.*

Claims 32-35 are directed towards a computer program for performing the steps found in claims 23-25, and 23 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Claims 42-44 are directed towards a client for performing the steps found in claims 23-25 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

#### *Response to Arguments*

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22-28, 30, 32-37, and 39-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The Applicants indicate that the newly amended claims overcome the prior art of record (pages 15-17). The Applicants are directed towards the newly added rejections in light of the newly introduced amendment.

#### *Conclusion*

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Geilhufe et al. (Pat. # 2003/0093281 A1).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(571)-273-8300 (for all Formal communications intended for entry)**



**CESAR PAULA  
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

5/11/06